

U.S. Serial No. 09/824,132 - Stephenson et al.

Remarks

This paper is responsive to the non-final office action of October 13, 2004.

Claims 1-46 stand rejected.

Claims 1 and 27 have been amended to incorporate the recitations of claims 3 and 33, respectively. Claims 2, 14, and 15 have been amended to comport with the amendments of claim 1. Claims 30, 31, 39, 41, 43, and 45 have been amended to more clearly point out the invention and not for reasons related to patentability.

Claims 3 and 33 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-32, and 34-46 remain.

For the following reasons, Applicants submit the application is allowable over the applied references.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Over TunnelBuilder for Mac: User's Guide

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11-33, and 36-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over *TunnelBuilder for Mac: User's Guide*. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

“ a second computer separated from said communications network, said second computer receiving information from said first server related to the information sent from said first computer ...

wherein said first computer transmits a message to said first server with an encrypted address of said second computer and

wherein said first server decrypts said encrypted address to an unencrypted address of said second computer and forwards said message to said second computer using said unencrypted address.”

The Examiner has cited NTS TunnelBuilder for Mac: User's Guide against the above-identified claims. In particular, the Examiner has cited to pages 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, and 3-17 in support of the rejection against the claims. The User's Guide describes a tunneling system that allows one to create a tunnel in a corporate firewall to reach a server inside a corporate network. See

U.S Serial No. 09/824,132 - Stephenson et al.

pages 1-3 and 4-15 through 4-18. While it generally mentions encryption on page 3-17, the User Guide is silent on the encryption of the address of the second computer as claimed. As the User Guide fails to disclose each and every recitation of claim 1, the claim is allowable over the User Guide. Dependent claims 2, 7-8, and 11-15 are allowable for at least this reason.

Independent claims 16, 19, 21, and 23-27 recite similar recitations pertaining to the encryption of an address of a second computer. As the User Guide fails to disclose the encryption of the second computer's address, these claims are allowable over the User Guide. Dependent claims 17-18, 20, 22, 28-33, and 36-38 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 39, 41, 43, and 45 recite at least "a header with encrypted information." The User Guide fails to disclose at least this recitation for reasons similar to those described above. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the User Guide. Dependent claims 40, 42, 44, and 46 are allowable for at least this reason.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Over TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website

Claims 1, 4, 5, 27, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

" a second computer separated from said communications network, said second computer receiving information from said first server related to the information sent from said first computer ...

wherein said first computer transmits a message to said first server with an encrypted address of said second computer and

wherein said first server decrypts said encrypted address to an unencrypted address of said second computer and forwards said message to said second computer using said unencrypted address."

Claim 27 includes similar language.

The TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website, as with the User Guide addressed above, fails to disclose the encrypted address of the second computer as claimed. The TunnelBuilder 4.01 reference is silent to the encryption of the address as now claimed in claims 1 and 27.

U.S. Serial No. 09/824,132 - Stephenson et al.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 27 (and dependent claims 4-5 and 34-35) are allowable over the reference.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Over TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website

Claims 6, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over TunnelBuilder in view of van der Sijpt. Applicants traverse the rejection.

The Examiner is not clear with which reference (the User Guide or TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website) the van der Sijpt patent has been combined. Nonetheless, van der Sijpt fails to remedy the failures of both the User Guide and TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website with respect to the encryption of the second address as claimed. As the User Guide and TunnelBuilder 4.01 for Windows Website both fail to teach or suggest the recited element and that the van der Sijpt patent fails to remedy these failures, the combination fails to teach or suggest claim 1. As claims 6, 9, and 10 are dependent from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the combination.

No fees are believed due with this amendment. However, in the event any fee is incurred for this submission, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0733. If there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Joseph M. Potenza
Registration No. 28,175

BA 38,800

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 508-9100

Dated: January 12, 2005